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Project Scale
Neighborhood, District and Corridor

Project Characteristics
Regional/town plan
Transit-oriented development
Infill/previously developed sites
Greenfield/previously undeveloped site
Placemaking plan (exclusively public space, civic buildings, or infrastructure)
Includes affordable/subsidized/social housing/mixed income

Land Area (in acres):
Harlem Park Area and Highway: approximately 360 acres

Parks/Open Space (indicate type and size):
Existing: 48.7 acres
Proposed: 55-76 acres by each design

Number of Residential Units:
Existing DUs: 4,680
Proposed: 4,130 - 5,556 by each design
Existing Density (DU/acre): 14.84
Proposed: 13.3-17 by each design

Residential Unit Types:
Existing: Single Family Town Houses and Some Multi-family Buildings
Proposed: In addition to above: Multi-Family Town Houses and Mixed-use Buildings

Retail, Office, Industrial Square Footage:
Varies by projects

Report

Urban design and the “Left-over” city, Harlem Park, Baltimore

This report provides an overview of the 2018 Graduate Level Urban Design Studio at the University of Maryland School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation. The major project of the semester was the analysis and development of proposals for the Harlem Park neighborhood in Baltimore with a focus as well on the Route 40 “Highway to Nowhere”. Emphasis was placed on plan strategies for the neighborhood, strategies for the re-use/ transformation of the highway and proposals that examine how a lower density neighborhood can be developed from the fragments of vacancy, urban space and infrastructure.

Project Process
Case Studies → Site Visit → Site Analysis → Strategies → Design
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project

The focus for the semester was the Harlem Park/US Route 40 area of Baltimore, a neighborhood suffering from blight, vacant homes, and the brutal introduction of a fragment of a highway that essentially divided the city in half. The urban design strategies for the studio was to use urban design to “re-inhabit” the neighborhood and transform the gash of the Route 40 “highway to nowhere” to again become a neighborhood of choice from the fragments of vacancy, urban space, and infrastructure that currently describe it.

Historically comprised rows of townhouses, Harlem Park Baltimore is also characterized by inner block parks, a failed experiment to introduce urban green space into the city and eliminate alley dwellings thought to be substandard in the 1960s. These green open spaces resulting from urban renewal plans were conceived to become gathering places for the community have become overgrown and unused due to poor surveillance and poor maintenance and have become magnets for less desirable activities. The scope of the project was to envision urban design alternatives that were practicable for the neighborhood and yet visionary in character.

Harlem Park in Baltimore

The name Harlem Park comes from Dutch merchant Adrian Valeck who arrived in Baltimore soon after the end of the Revolutionary War in the late 1700s. In 1857, a group of nearby property-owners donated land to the city to establish Lafayette Square, a new public park surrounded by important historic churches and congregations of West Baltimore.

After the Civil War the city swelled in size and entrepreneurial builders in West Baltimore doubled their early development efforts. Dedicated in 1876, Harlem Square brought even more new residents to the area with developers in the 1870s and 1880s building hundreds of row-houses in the blocks around Harlem Park including amenities like gas lighting, hot water, and doorbells.

In the early 1900s, residents in Harlem Park fought to exclude African-Americans by imposing deed restrictions on local property-owners and harassing black households who tried to buy homes around Harlem Park. By the 1920s, however, the city’s growing black middle-class successfully gained access to more desirable properties while many of the area’s white residents moved away to newer suburban communities. By the early 1930s, the neighborhood was largely African-American comprised of African-American doctors and lawyers in grand houses alongside working-class tenants in boarding houses and smaller alley houses. Harlem Park became an integral part of a black community that grew to include homes, churches, and businesses from North Avenue to Franklin Street and Eutaw Place to Fulton Avenue.

After World War II, many of Baltimore’s older communities faced new challenges of overcrowded and deteriorating housing, sparking a controversial program of “urban renewal” that mixed social programs, demolition and rehabilitation projects, a new school, and new housing over a twelve-block area. The rise of the automobile made more dramatic changes as city streets in the area converted from two-way to one-way and the city demolished scores of homes south of Franklin Street for the development of the East-West Expressway. The inner block parks and the Harlem Park Elementary Middle School are both legacies from this period of change. The neighborhood’s 1961 urban renewal plan created almost thirty small parks and playgrounds. Demolition started in the 1960s, requiring the relocation of hundreds of local residents, but the development of the parks proceeded slowly. The introduction of the inner-block parks also challenged the neighborhood culture of socializing on the front steps of Baltimore row-houses contributing to the isolation of the new parks at the backs of houses.

In January 2016, a four-year partnership between the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, the Maryland Stadium Authority, and the Baltimore City Department of Housing and Community Development was created to acquire and demolish thousands of vacant buildings, serve as the catalyst for redevelopment and reinvestment,
and bring stabilization to Harlem Park. Project Creating Opportunities for Renewal and Enterprise - or Project C.O.R.E. aims is to demolish as many blighted properties as possible over four years, focusing on half- and whole-blocks of blight in order to maximize neighborhood impact, minimize vacancy and provide opportunities for new development. C.O.R.E also funds the stabilization of selected properties for future rehabilitation and redevelopment and the State has committed to leverage an estimated $600 million through existing programs to encourage new investment in challenged communities. The program has seen some initial successes although today much of the inner fabric of Harlem Park remains empty.

**The Harlem Park Studio Project**
The Harlem Park Studio Project offers revitalization strategies by proposing both bold and drastic measures as well as smaller, incremental changes. The five proposals vary in detail but all use similar strategies to incrementally infill existing blocks, create open spaces and parks of diverse sizes and uses, re-invent the role of the depressed highway, provide resources and places for residents, and establish a new and positive identity for the Harlem Park neighborhood.
Initial investigations included urban scale research, design exercises, case study explorations, a class study trip to Philadelphia, and site analysis of Harlem Park. This process consisted of:

- Researching site demographics and characteristics;
- Mapping C.O.R.E Demolition phases planned large scale demolition projects and how that impacts the form of the community;
- Identifying opportunities and constrain and existing assets such as historic landmarks and community characteristics;
- Identifying historic and existing land uses and important commercial areas;
- Identifying important connections to adjacent communities;
- Mapping public transportation and planning for future additions such as reconsidering the Red Line Transit corridor;
- Measuring walkability to important transit nodes such as the two main transit stations to the North East and South West of the neighborhood;
- Understanding Harlem Park’s block structure, dimensions, and housing typologies to understand where new housing development can be located;
- How can the neighborhood take advantage of Transit-Oriented Development?

Harlem Park Demographics:
With a total population today of 62,065 residents and with high vacancy rates, Harlem Park is clearly underpopulated and in comparison to its zoning lacks density. The area is mainly zoned as R-8 (Row-house Residential District):

- Single-family semi-detached housing (21.7 units per acre);
- Single-family attached townhouses (58 units per acre);
- Multi-family housing (58 units per acre);
- Limited non-residential uses.

There are some smaller areas zoned as C-1, TOD, and OS. It can be argued that there can be much improvements by adding more TOD zoning areas. Demographic characteristics:

- Low life expectancy compared to the nation (78.6);
- Only a small percentage of the population (5%) have a college education, and 21% of the population is unemployed. Harlem Park also suffers from chronic absenteeism in school-age children;
- With a low annual income, 50% of the population spends more than 50% of their income on living expenses, such as rent;
- About 56% do not own cars with about 43% of the population using public transportation. 43% of residents with jobs travel more than 45 minutes to get to work.

Poverty Rates

Below or near poverty, 2009-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income: $22,277 Per Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment: 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy: 65.3 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide Rates: 45.3 PER 10,000 Residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross Housing Density (includes streets, public spaces, etc.) = 8 DUs per Acre
Gross Population Density = 21 People per Acre
Net Housing Density (includes residential lots only) = 10 DUs per Acre
Net Population Density = 28 People per Acre
(Source: Census 2010)
Harlem Park is served by two transit stations: to the southwest is the West Baltimore Station serving the MARC Penn Line; and to the northeast is Upton Ave Market station a Metro Subway Link that extends east to Johns Hopkins Hospital. In the heart of the neighborhood stands the Harlem Park Elementary and Middle School, Augusta Fells Savage Institute of Visual Art, and The Umoa Head Start Academy.

Harlem Park is also well-known for its row houses, many built in the late 19th Century and typically larger than the row houses on the eastern side of the city. After years of decline exacerbated by poverty, many of these houses are vacant, and large parts of the neighborhood are the subject of demolition plans by the C.O.R.E program. One feature leftover by failed planning efforts of the past includes many inner block parks, public spaces intended to provide green open space for the community but generally abandoned because of unsafe visibility and poor access.

**US Route 40- “The Highway to Nowhere”**

Urban Renewal of the 1960s resulted in the demolition of scores of homes south of Franklin Street for the development of the East-West Expressway, intended to make a highway connection from downtown to the western suburbs. Constructed as a depressed highway, this “gash” in the landscape resulted in the displacement of many poor and minority residents before it was stopped and left uncompleted in the ‘80s. The result is a curious 1.2 mile stretch of highway infrastructure becoming infamous as “The Highway to Nowhere”. The extension of the Red Line transit corridor was planned to run along this highway but the plans for this major transit rail project were shelved in 2015.

As part of the design effort, the studio studied highway transformations from around the world to re-imagine the future of Route 40. Principles such as creating connections to the city, managing stormwater, creating green networks, and adding amenities and value to the area were considered.
Public Transportation and Street Hierarchy
The 14 mile extension of the Red Transit Line (canceled in 2015) has been a consideration in all proposals. This transit line, which was seeking to connect east and west Baltimore, has not been precluded from future plans as either light-rail, underground subway, or a bus rapid system. More locally, an important strategy of the semester was improving and designing street sections to incorporate spaces for different transportation modes. Below (left) we can see a typical street section in Harlem Park today, showing how much space could be dedicated to better street-scape design, appropriate widths, and designated spaces for other transportation types.

Land use
The majority of the Harlem Park neighborhood is row houses, with small commercial stores scattered along major transit corridors. The neighborhood is also home to many beautiful churches, particularly around Lafayette Square on the eastern side of the community. Two schools currently occupy the northern edge of Harlem Park and each scheme takes an approach to keeping or relocating the schools.

Green Space Acreage: 26.89 acres
Approximately 26 areas are dedicated to usable green space in the neighborhood with each group seeking to retain this amount by relocating, re-programming or redesigning the inner block parks for better usage, and by taking advantage of the “Road to Nowhere” by transforming all or parts of that area into usable park space.

Walkability and TOD
The neighborhood is very walkable, approximately a 10 minute (1/2 mile) distance across its length. This metric helps to locate services in the area and enhance access to both train stations, both within an easy walk from the center of the neighborhood. New services and amenities can be introduced such as enhanced sidewalks and bike paths, reinforcing the idea of a walkable and sustainable neighborhood. Many of the existing row houses are too large for a single-family, and there is little variety in terms of housing types in the neighborhood, also reflected in less value in the marketplace. Strategies included adding smaller units and introducing “right-sized” row houses, detached, and semi-detached types to enhance neighborhood market variety. In addition, adding mixed-used development close to transit stops was considered as a solution to diversify and densify the area.
CASE STUDIES: CITIES

Harlem Park Context
The studio research for the project looked at a wide array of America’s cities and neighborhood planning and urban design precedents. In particular, the Harlem Park grid was compared to many other urban grids in terms of size, orientation, street widths, and building typology.

This analysis resulted in understanding the scale of Harlem Park’s block structure and understanding what can be done within this scale.

Categories for analysis included:
- Grid structure
- Block sizes
- Block density
- Individual lot sizes
- Street sections
- Street hierarchy
- Density placement
- Land-use
- Building and housing types
- Public spaces

Harlem Park Studio Trip to Philadelphia
For the research portion of the semester, the studio visited several neighborhoods in Philadelphia PA looking at the historic Penn Plan and the manner in which the city has grown from its origins. In particular, historic neighborhoods with different housing typologies were visited and blocks and streets were sketched and measured.

Philadelphia

[Sketches in the field]

Harlem Park Typical Grid Size
Designed in 1909 by Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., Forest Hill Gardens is a well-known example of the Garden City movement and hosts mixed-use and mixed-income sub-urban community with:

- 175 acres with 4500 residents;
- 800 free standing and attached houses, 11 apartment buildings, churches and storefronts;
- Main concepts:
  - Breaking the grid;
  - Lower density in an urban community;
  - Mix with topography and landscape.
- 169 Acres with 1,394 dwelling Units;
- 8 Dwelling units per acre.

A garden turned district/city neighborhood, Hyde Park has a regular block structure and a large green comparable to Harlem Park’s “Highway to Nowhere”.

- Mixing housing types on one block (apartments, detached single family housing, etc.);
- Institutions throughout the area;
- Incorporation of linear green spaces:
  - Multiple public parks help connect spaces and provide a public amenity;
  - Trees line streets and hide some imperfections in housing.
- Maintaining the flow of traffic along main boulevards through park and abandoned railway;
- Larger blocks are cut by alleys with:
  - Back of houses, yards, and garages.
- 11.8 Dwelling units per acre.
Savannah, Georgia

Planned in 1732 by James Oglethorpe along the Savannah River, the plan has a sophisticated and adaptable block structure, street hierarchy, architectural character, and land use development. Savannah was identified as one of the strongest precedents for The Harlem Park area.

Highlights:
- Human scale city;
- Connection of neighborhoods;
- Organized city into neighborhoods;
- Hierarchy of wards, blocks;
- Public green in a city;
- Street Hierarchy;
- Diversity of lot sizes, diversity of building typologies, and diversity of people.

Georgetown, Washington DC

Georgetown is a historic neighborhood and a commercial and entertainment district located in northwest Washington, D.C., situated along the Potomac River. Founded in 1751 the city was the main port for the region and predated the establishment of the federal district and the City of Washington by 40 years. Situated on the Fall Line, Georgetown was the farthest point upstream that oceangoing boats could navigate the Potomac River.

Highlights:
- Diverse row house typology;
- Narrow, intimate streets;
- Diverse block sizes;
- Connects to open space at the waterfront.
Central Artery: The Big Dig, Boston, MA

What was the issue?
- Traffic congestion;
- Parking underneath was dark and unsafe;
- Unpleasant and stressful experience.

What was successful?
- Improved traffic and connected 3 cities;
- More light at ground level;
- Enhanced human experience;
- Green space in the city;
- Better air quality;
- Added value to the city.

Before

After

The Big Dig on Harlem Park

Harlem Park Route 40

The depressed US Route 40 was compared in scale to many corridor revitalization projects from around the world. Many cities have eliminated elevated or depressed urban highways and added amenities while maintaining mobility.

The depressed highway has resulted in the Harlem Park neighborhood being cut off from its surrounding neighborhoods, particularly to the south. The studio focused on project solutions that create assets and amenities for the region, and connect Harlem Park to its surrounding neighborhoods.
Park East Freeway, Milwaukee, WI

What are the issue?
• Incomplete execution of elevated highway intending to connect into the downtown;
• Not heavily used because of short length;
• Peak traffic volume below capacity;
• Breaks continuity of downtown grid;
• Expensive.

What was successful?
• Removed freeway;
• Created a master-plan for redevelopment;
• Slowly reconnected that area of downtown Milwaukee;
• Giving back underutilized space to the community.

Embarcadero Boulevard, San Francisco, CA

What was the issue?
• The Embarcadero Freeway blocked the city from the port - the city’s reason for being;
• The area that was once an amenity, a crucial part of the city, became one that was neglected.

What was successful?
• Removed freeway and reduced traffic speed;
• Implemented multiple modes of transportation: Pedestrian, cyclist, car, bus, streetcar;
• Connected the city back to the waterfront;
• Housing, jobs, and property values increased;
• The multi-use boulevard attracts locals and tourists daily.

[Images of before and after diagrams for both projects]
Cheonggyecheon, Seoul, South Korea

What was the issue?
- Division of north and south downtown (highway as a divider);
- Lack of pedestrian roads (unsafe);
- Elevated Highway emphasized slum area.

What was successful?
- Stitched north and south downtown together;
- Restoration of stream and two historic bridges;
- Promotes habitats for wildlife;
- Increased land value of the surrounding areas;
- Area is now used by multiple modes of transportation: pedestrian, bus, cars;
- Reduced temperature of downtown Seoul by 3 degrees Celsius.

Rio Madrid, Spain

What was the issue?
- Neighborhoods divided by highway that bordered both sides of the river;
- Communities shut off from each other because of highway barrier;
- Lost riverfront amenity.

What was successful?
- Communities united once again;
- Open green/park space created as a large-scale amenity for neighborhoods;
- Retained highway system although now sunken streets.
Comparison: Figure Grounds & Sections

US Route 40 Figure Ground

Figure-Ground Studies
Comparing figure-ground maps and sections at the same scale helps to see how Harlem Park compares in scale, context, fabric, and organization to the various highway revitalization projects.

Rio Madrid (Spain) and Cheonggyecheon (South Korea) are strong examples of the combination of natural and urban environments.

Boston, with dimensions similar to Harlem Park’s highway, is a great example of knitting a large green infrastructure within a city by depressing a highway.

San Francisco shows the importance of pleasant street sections and the incorporation of public transit within such corridors.

And lastly, Park East in Milwaukee is an example of re-purposing large tracts of land created by deleting highways within our cities and creating developments that can support new development, provide new public spaces, residential diversity, and public amenities and services.
The urban blocks of Harlem Park were transformed in the 1960s with the demolition of the alley housing and the introduction of about 30 inner block parks. These small green spaces are typically 3-4 acres and were intended to increase the amount of green space in the neighborhood but suffered from disuse because of difficult access and poor positive surveillance. The majority today are overgrown, unused, and unsafe. Inner-block parks, shown in the adjacent section, are typically empty green spaces. Most do not have direct access and residents must exit the front of their houses and circle around to enter the space. Over time, most residents did not visit the spaces or permit their small children to play in the spaces and the inner block parks became locations for illicit activities.

Harlem Park also suffers from a monolithic streetscape design and little hierarchy or variety. Although most houses line streets, today with many gaps, many streets lack space-defining trees and unnecessarily wide cart ways encourage higher speeds of traffic.

Below are images of Harlem Park’s blocks, housing, and streetscapes. Although much deterioration is present, the unique character of West Baltimore is visible even today. Row houses, vacant sites, and street sections present us with the potential to create a vibrant future for this area.
Typical Row House
One of Harlem Park’s main characteristics is its traditional row houses. With typically two to three main floors and a basement, these units line the streets of Harlem Park and the front stoops are places of gathering and social interaction. Originally developed as larger alternatives to small row houses on the opposite side of the city near Baltimore’s port, the typical Harlem Park row house is situated on a deep lot and can range from three to five levels. Bay windows and late nineteenth century detailing are also characteristic of the neighborhood.

With the decrease in the size of the typical American family, the Harlem Park house became too large for one family and was often subdivided into apartments, often with absentee ownership.

Additional Housing Style: Bay Window

Additional Housing Style: Pitched Roof
With a history of redlining and tragic urban renewal, Harlem Park is the typical inner-city story of disinvestment. With an unemployment rate of 21%, an income of $22,277 per person, a homicide rate of 45.3 per 10,000 people, the neighborhood is today a place of poverty, neglect, and vacancy. The studio sought to demonstrate how the physical fabric of the neighborhood can be incrementally revitalized with new housing types, mixed-use development, transformed street design and generous open spaces to create amenities that would bring investment and new development to this historic piece of Baltimore.

Taking advantage of the city's demolition plans, the studio identified physical, social and environmental assets that define the fundamental characteristics of the Harlem Park neighborhood and designed to give identity and provide a clear sense of “place”. Design options promoted natural landscapes; adding wetlands, water bodies, gardens, and agricultural uses.

Quality street design is essential to any successful urban neighborhood. Harlem Park today suffers from unnecessarily wide streets with little to no hierarchy in the street grid. Primary design explorations were made to reconfigure the street grid and/or redesign street sections to accommodate different modes of mobility, from pedestrian, bike, private vehicles, to transit options. Priority was given to pedestrian safety and comfort with streets also reconfigured include stormwater infrastructure considerations.

Mixed-use land use in each option were focused within walking distance to the transit centers. In some cases, a new proposed open space proposed the demolition and relocation of existing public resources, such as schools. In addition, sports fields within parks were added and expanded as overall assets for the community.

Harlem Park’s inner block parks are visually overgrown, provide no direct access from the back of homes that face them, and today are unused and unsafe places. Special attention was paid in the studio to reusing the inner block parks by adding housing units that face the public spaces and add housing diversity. These reclaimed spaces offer the potential to reactivate the neighborhood and provide real estate value for private development facing green spaces. Historic buildings and green spaces such as Lafayette Park were preserved, and special attention was paid to future infill buildings that respect and build upon the existing architectural character of West Baltimore. Different housing types were programmed and placed within the block structures in order to bring together diverse ages, races, incomes, and family sizes within close proximity.

The Harlem Park Studio conceived of public gathering spaces to be physically distinctive, vibrant, have positive surveillance, and be accessible to the community. Green networks were studied and created in different scales:

- In the urban fabric connecting the community within;
- Green networks connecting Harlem Park to surrounding neighborhoods;
- In combination with transit corridors and especially by reconfiguring the highway to connect to the city and larger region.

Each option proposes transforming the sunken highway to become an asset used for future development, open space or both. The highway and its vast acreage offers a variety of possibilities from parking for the planned future development to open spaces for city-wide sports, natural resources, farm lands, recreation spaces, areas for social interaction, and economic and cultural activities.

"These thoughtful options for Harlem Park can give community residents and leaders a new way of seeing the potential for this historic community, particularly how well designed public spaces can help communities adjust to depopulation and disinvestment. We will take these ideas forward in discussions with local residents and public officials."

Carol Gilbert
Assistant Secretary
Division of Neighborhood Revitalization
MD Department of Housing & Community Development
Option 1: Harlem Park

Illustrative Master Plan: An attempt at revitalizing a neglected city by taking bold measures. Creating a regional park that not only provides a natural resource and places of leisure, but also gives residents an identity within the city. The park aims to be a connector to the surrounding neighborhoods and city.

Places Diagram: The park's organic shape was formed by mapping the major connecting streets and synthesizing them with the leftover void space resulting from the city demo. Within the Park, community based uses are located to the North; the community garden, playground, basketball courts. As we move toward the South, the ponds, larger fields, and schools are placed to create connection between neighborhoods and be close to educational facilities in the area.
Option 1: Harlem Park

**Popolton Pond**: Places of play, exercise, leisure for the community. In addition, the park takes advantage of these ponds for storm water management.

**Penrose Pond Street Edge**: The Park edges meet the neighborhood. Wider sidewalks, bike paths, sufficient parking and lighting, and town homes facing the street, create a safe and sustainable environment.

**MLK Traffic Circle**: Nodes that not just organize and connect the street hierarchy, but provide identity and a clear sense of location.

**MLK Traffic Circle**: Places of play, exercise, leisure for the community. In addition, the park takes advantage of these ponds for storm water management.

**Longitudinal section**: Using the highway inset as parking. Also, placing the potential Red Line metro below ground.

---

**Above**: Highway development and connection to transit center to the West. Map showing TOD development around train & Metro stations, with the park in the middle of a 10 min walk.

---

**Above**: Land use

- Total DUs before demo: 4,680
- Ave. DUs/Acre before demo: 14.81
- Total Existing green space: 48.7 acres

- Total proposed DUs: 5,556
- Ave. proposed DUs/Acre: 17.78
- Total proposed green space: 94.62 acres
Option 1: Harlem Park

Phasing: Phasing is programmed to create this large scale green in smaller phases. Starting with bridging over the highway where the park connects to the southern neighborhood. Each section will develop the blocks adjacent to it. The last phase will add large scale Multifamily housing and density along the sunken highway to the West in addition to developing a new train station (below).
Option 1: Harlem Park

“Harlem Park” is a Transit Oriented multi-phased solution that takes advantage of the housing vacancy to create a regional scale asset in Harlem Park, similar to Patterson Park on the east side of the city. The park serves as a focal point for the west side and a connector between Harlem Park and its surrounding neighborhoods.

**TOD and Mapping the Park**
The Park is shaped by the pattern of void space created by existing and proposed demolition, moving the residential density toward the train station and subway station, and reinforcing the main connector streets. The result is a picturesque edge that engages many residential areas and connects to neighborhoods adjacent to Harlem Park. The Park includes recreational and educational spaces. On the north side more community-based uses are located, such as the community garden, playground, and basketball courts. Toward the south, water features (storm water management), and larger fields and schools are located as assets connecting neighborhoods.

**The Highway as an Asset**
The design proposal takes advantage of the sunken highway in the form of parking for future development. This linear development transforms the highway lanes to become urban boulevards that connect to the larger city. Development along this line includes a newly Harlem Park transit station, recreational space, grocery stores, commercial buildings, and mixed-use residential buildings that serve the region. A potential Red-line station is also included in the middle of this development at Metro Plaza.

**Blocks and Streets**
Blocks structures were changed to take out the otherwise unsafe and overgrown inner block parks and add housing diversity with mixed typologies and alleyways. The street grid is modified to create three levels of hierarchy by the introduction of smaller one ways streets.

Harlem PARK seeks to revitalize the neighborhood by taking bold and drastic transformations, via a regional park that provides a natural resource and places of leisure for its residents and offers them a new identity within the city. The park connects to the surrounding neighborhoods and offers the possibility to unite the neighborhoods of the east side of Baltimore.

TEAM:
Kyle Huck
Sara G. Samar
Casey Huntington
Sarah Wright
Option 2: Harlem Gardens

Illustrative Master Plan: A place-based, multi-step proposal to create an energized neighborhood in Harlem Park.

Places Diagram: Capitalizing on the strengths of the existing amenities by developing “nodes” around the perimeter; Union Square, Harlem Station, Fulton North, Upton Plaza, and Gateway East create urban spaces with their own identities and purposes to create a mixed-use community.

View to North

The Savannah Block
Restoring Harlem Park alley houses & inner block parks with the Savannah Block as inspiration.

Existing Conditions
Opportunity to densify and subdivide as value is added to the neighborhood.
Option 2: Harlem Gardens

Harlem Gardens: This historic place is home to a vibrant, tight-knit community that takes pride in their neighborhood. The design takes an inside-outside approach in order to develop and create a safe neighborhood, equipped with green space and exciting community “nodes.” The intervention improves access to education, healthcare, and job opportunities.

Total proposed DUs: 4192
Ave. proposed DUs/Acre: 13.54

Highway Intervention: Adding a Bus Rapid Transit System to support the unique community nodes, improving transportation to and from Harlem Park and reconnecting it to the city of Baltimore. This phase develops the “Harlem Station” node, and a new Elementary and Middle School.
Phasing: Phasing is programmed in three steps. Below, we can also see the Highway development process:

**Phase 1:**
- Implement ideal Savannah blocks: With large parks, new housing types, and newly subdivided land;
- Bus Rapid System (BRT): Along the existing inbound route 40 lane;
- MARC Train development node (Harlem Station);
- New Elementary and Middle school and facilities.

**Phase 2:**
- Develop Harlem Park;
- Infill remaining blocks around park;
- Construction of “Union Square” with a new Civic Center that straddles the new route-40 park;
- Recreation node;
- Workspace in Ice-house.

**Phase 3:**
- Develop Greenhouse, metro, and park node;
- Develop the remaining community centers;
- Further downtown development;
- Infill remaining blocks.

Housing Types and Lot Sizes:
The new urban grid also incorporates a variety of building types and housing typologies with a plot plan that can be easily subdivided to accommodate growth in the neighborhood. This model allows Harlem Park to densify and grow while still maintaining a pattern of development. Current residents can invest in their community while also welcoming new community members.

**Option 2: Harlem Gardens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types and Lot Sizes</th>
<th>Duplex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type A</strong>: Wide Commercial Corridor Median</td>
<td><strong>Type C</strong>: Wide Streets with Wide Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type B</strong>: Slow Narrow Roads With Planting</td>
<td><strong>Type D</strong>: Pedestrian Way With Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Type E</strong>: Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Harlem Station Gateway East**

**Travel Posters**
Option 2: Harlem Gardens

Harlem Gardens is a place-based, multi-step proposal to create an energized neighborhood in Harlem Park, Baltimore. It takes an inside-outside approach in order to develop and create a safe neighborhood, equipped with green space and exciting community “nodes.” A new urban grid scheme and a Bus Rapid Transit System support the unique community nodes, improving transportation to and from Harlem Park and reconnecting it to the city of Baltimore.

Guiding this proposal was an in-depth look at the strengths, opportunities, and weaknesses of Harlem Park. This historic community is home to a vibrant, tight-knit community that takes pride in their neighborhood. This proposal focuses the need to improve access to education, healthcare, and job opportunities in Harlem Park. The proposal introduces new development that complements the success of existing amenities. Thus, the existing residents play a major role in improving education, healthcare, and job opportunities in their community.

Community “Nodes”

A focus of this proposal is to capitalize on the strengths of the existing amenities in the community by developing “nodes” around the perimeter of Harlem Park. Union Square, Harlem Station, Fulton North, Upton Plaza, and Gateway East create different urban spaces with their own identities and purposes to create a true mixed-use community.

Grid Plan

Using Savannah, Georgia as a precedent, Harlem Gardens creates an urban pattern of green spaces fronted by houses and mixed-use buildings. These urban parks pay homage to the original Harlem Park park system, while also creating different scales of green spaces. With this development, houses can front the parks, improving safety within the community.

Housing Types and Lot Sizes

The new urban grid also incorporates a variety of building types and housing typologies with a plot plan that can be easily subdivided to accommodate growth in the neighborhood. This model allows Harlem Park to densify and grow while still maintaining a pattern of development. Current residents can invest in their community while also welcoming new community members.

TEAM:
Alia Abu- Doulech
Christina Wan
Lauren Gilmartin
Antoinette Black
Option 3: The P.A.R.C

Illustrative Master Plan: Focuses on value creation and community rehabilitation

Places Diagram: Above shows nodes and corridors of development in order to add value and also different scales of green networks and nodes of the neighborhood. By providing open recreation spaces and revitalizing Fulton Street, assets will be added that will provide a reason to move into Harlem Park.

Existing Conditions

Block Type 1

Block Type 2
Option 3: The P.A.R.C: Parks, Amenities, Revitalization, Community, and Sustainability

Green Connection: With the addition of a park system, an opportunity is provided to implement sustainable features in Harlem Park & serve as a city model.

Harlem Wetlands: A large bio-swale will act as flood mitigation and provide the park with a unique natural feature.

Sports Zone

The proposed green network will include different tree types and bio-retention planters in order to collect and purify the water run off.

The P.A.R.C: The concept is to give the residents options for community recreation. One of the major problems identified was the lack of a used park in Harlem Park. This project introduces a variety of scales of public parks. The multiple scales of parks will create multiple scales of community. These scales include a regional linear park, the revitalization of Harlem Park, a procession of neighborhood parks, and inner court parks. The regional Park will act as city connector, bringing people from the University of Maryland's Baltimore Campus into contact with people from Lexington to people from Franklin Square.

Art Hub Plan & Transect
Harlem Wetlands Plan & Transect
Gateway Plan & Transect
Sport Zone Plan & Transect

Total proposed DUs: 4409
Ave. proposed DUs/Acre: 14.25
Total proposed green space: 76.36 acres
Option 3: The P.A.R.C: Parks, Amenities, Revitalization, Community, and Sustainability

- **Phase 1: Additional Demo**
- **Phase 2: Community recreational spaces**
- **Phase 3: Growth surrounding rec. spaces**
- **Phase 4: Desification along Fulton ave. and Franklin st.**
- **Phase 5: Additional densification**

**Existing block park condition**

**Phase 1: Developing inner parks and filling in the gaps**

**Phase 2: Demo buildings**

**Phase 3: Fill in remaining edges and introduce courts**

**Phase 4: Add density along interior streets**

**Block Phasing (Left):** In order to create the changes within the existing Harlem Park Blocks (to the left) we can see how new construction is added to the perimeters and inner block parks are developed and later courts and density is added.

**Street Sections (Below)**

**Proposed Green Street**

**Proposed Fulton St.**

**Proposed Boulevard**

**Connection to the city’s green network**

**Phasing:** Phasing is programmed to begin by first creating the assets and attracting development. First, we develop the recreational spaces, their surrounding, along main boulevards, and in the last phase throughout the neighborhood.

Below we can see how the green network connects to Baltimore’s green network and the rest of the city.

**Distinctive Final Figure Ground**
Option 3: The P.A.R.C:

P.A.R.C.S. focuses on the value creation and community rehabilitation of Harlem Park Baltimore.

**Parks:** One of the major problems identified was the lack of a safe and asset-rich park in Harlem Park. This project introduces a variety of scales of public parks that includes a regional linear park, the revitalization of the existing Harlem Park, a network of smaller neighborhood parks, and inner court parks. The goal is to give residents many options for community recreation.

**Amenities:** Historic Harlem Park is in desperate need of value creation. The proposed C.O.R.E demolition provides an opportunity to add value to certain areas of the city. By providing these open recreation spaces and revitalizing Fulton Street, assets will be added that will provide a reason to move into Harlem Park.

**Revitalization:** Currently, Harlem Park is known for its inner block park structure. Several issues were identified with this model highlighted the lack of perceived ownership of the inner-park and lack of public eyes on the park. In order to combat these issues, the project suggests the redevelopment of these spaces within the blocks. The open space would be reoriented with new fronts of housing facing onto the park, followed by the potential development of the inner block. In addition to adjusting the block structure, a mix of housing, from small and medium-sized detached housing is introduced for housing diversity.

**Community:** The multiple scales of parks create multiple scales of the community starting with smaller courts on a block-by-block basis. The smaller city parks provide areas for safe social activity and can be easily seen from adjacent private residencies. The regional Park acts as a city connector, bringing people from the University of Maryland’s Baltimore Campus into contact with people from different neighborhoods on the West side.

**Sustainability:** The large park system provides an opportunity to implement sustainable features in Harlem Park, which could serve as a model for the greater Baltimore area. US Route 40 is located at a topographical low point in the area and is subject to flooding. The addition of a large bio-swale can act as flood mitigation and provide the park with a unique natural feature for the treatment of stormwater.

Finally the proposed green network includes different tree types and bio-retention planters in order to collect and purify the water runoff on neighborhood streets.

**TEAM:** Andrea De Carlo
Sara Conover
Ana Nicolich
Patricia Rowedder
Option 4: Harlem Places

Illustrative Master Plan: Revitalization involves three primary design principles: establishing place hierarchy that brings value to the neighborhood, reinforcing connectivity through the neighborhood and back to the rest of the city, and de-densifying the struggling real estate.

Places Diagram: An adaptive contingent strategy. The first step was categorizing regions of the neighborhood by their level of success in density and ownership. By identifying three intervention zones, the neighborhood was broken up into methods ranging from minimal intervention, teeth capping, to medium intervention and maximum intervention.
Option 4: Harlem Places

Harlem Places: Particular zones of interest that currently have value or possess potential to create value were identified. These zones are imagined to be developed chronologically, beginning with (First Phase) improving the land use around the school and revamping Harlem Park and the school yards. This design aims to rejuvenate life and value in a historic neighborhood through a series of realistic and attainable projects.

- **Total proposed DUs:** 4,512
- **Ave. proposed DUs/Acre:** 13.85

Fulton Mall: The third phase enhanced the hierarchy of Fulton Avenue.

**Existing Conditions**

**Proposed Illustrated**

- **The second phase** involved bringing higher density to the transportation asset at the west end of the highway.

- **The final phase** turned the east end of the highway to an accessible sky park that connected Harlem Park to downtown.
Option 4: Harlem Places

Phase 1 Additional Demo

Phase 1 Construction

All Demo

Phase 2 Construction

Phase 3 Construction

Harlem Gardens Residences: Sections

Fulton Mall: Section

Harlem Gardens Residences Before and After

Fulton Mall Before and After

Housing Typology

Travel Posters
Option 4: Harlem Places

**Approach**

Harlem Places focuses on revitalization goals in three primary design principles: establishing a place hierarchy that brings value to the neighborhood; reinforcing connectivity between the neighborhood and the rest of the city; and, incrementally densifying the neighborhood through strategic new residential development.

The first step was analyzing the neighborhood by their level of success in density and ownership. By identifying three intervention zones, the neighborhood was broken up into areas ranging from minimal intervention, medium intervention, and maximum intervention. In the medium and maximum intervention zones, particular zones of interest that currently have value or possess the potential to create value are proposed for new development. These zones are imagined to be developed in a phased sequence, beginning with improving the land use around the school and revamping Harlem Park and the adjacent schoolyards.

The second phase involves bringing higher density to the transportation asset at the west end of the highway with mixed-use development. The third phase enhanced the hierarchy of Fulton Avenue. The final phase turned the east end of the highway to an accessible sky park that connected Harlem Park to downtown.

To enhance safety, value and connectivity block structures are modified to put “eyes on the street”, a local green network is proposed, and the highway is re-imagined as a potential asset. The design aims to rejuvenate life and value in a historic neighborhood through a series of realistic, phased, and attainable projects.

**TEAM:**
Andrea Nichols
Emma Weber
Amy Duan
Juhi Goel
Option 5: Harlem Park

Illustrative Master Plan: An attempt to revitalize a neighborhood by investing in the creation of local jobs, local food sources, and sustainable solutions leading to a high quality of life and sustainability.

Places Diagrams

Institutional Buildings

Multi-Family Housing

Corner Stores

View to North East

Left: Considering larger multi-family buildings along the south edge highway blocks.

Above: Adding housing units and frontage to inner block parks.
Option 5: Harlem Park

Green Connection: Creating a pedestrian friendly gateway and point of entry to Harlem Farms and the park.

Corner Stores: Designed at corners and located throughout the neighborhoods to provide walkable access to all.

Harlem Park and Harlem Farms: Harlem Farms is a reuse intervention that seeks to take advantage of the highway as an opportunity for urban farming in order to bring jobs and economic growth to the community. To complete this idea, a market space is provided to sell produce. In addition, storm water is managed and anchor music venue is provided for art and cultural activities. The Red line is considered an on ground rail system.

Total proposed DUs: 4,131
Ave. proposed DUs/Acre: 13.35

Green Connection

MARC TOD
ANCHOR MUSIC VENUE
FRANKLIN STREET MARKET
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE CENTER
UMD BIO PARK

Highway Intervention: Harlem Farms

Storm Water Treatment along highway intervention: Supports Farm-lands.
Option 5: Harlem Park

C.O.R.E Demo and VBN

Street Types

Additional Demo

Block Structures

Phasing Strategy

Distinctive Final Figure Ground

Street Types

Housing typology

Fulton St.

Row Homes: Block Exteriors

Franklin St.

Duplex: Inner Block End Caps

Primary Streets

Duplex: Inner Block Park Boarders

Secondary Streets

2 over 1: Between Street and Inner Block Park

Travel Posters
Option 5: Harlem Park & Harlem Farms

**Approach**
This scheme identifies several key challenges and opportunities in the area. First and foremost, existing square blocks are doubled in size to form rectangles. This simple adjustment creates much-needed street hierarchy, provides key intersections for corner stores, and allows visibility and ownership into the center of blocks.

The existing Harlem Park is expanded and surrounded by local amenities such as a new school, library, commercial, and residential development.

The highway adaptation takes advantage of access to sun, water, and space rarely found in urban centers. The northern half of the highway is transformed into a regional amenity, a public park promenade along which urban farming, solar energy collection, and stormwater treatment are conducted. This promenade will spur future development around the highway anchored by the MARC train station to the West, Harlem Park Market at the center, and an Environmental Education and Visitor Center at the Eastern end.

Lastly the Southern half of the sunken highway is reserved for a light rail system connecting into the heart of Baltimore city.

TEAM:
Emily Broxmeyer
Chris Ramirez
Marissa Tonkay
Adan Ramos
LESSONS LEARNED

Urban design requires both the knowledge in building types, public space, and street design and existing cultural and specific physical histories of a place. Precedents varying in scale and context provide insight into places that work and when compared, their physical characteristics inform new proposals.

At the regional scale essential connections to the surrounding neighborhoods are emphasized via important transportation corridors, important streets, location of amenities, and green networks. At the neighborhood scale, inner block parks are transformed by adding new housing types, creating vibrant and safe gathering spaces, and modifying the street grid. Lastly, considerations for all transportation types are essential, with an emphasis on vibrant and safe pedestrian and bicycle networks.

At Harlem Park we see the potential for:

- New green spaces strategically placed and programmed for better use;
- A variety of new housing types creating the opportunity for a new neighborhood of diverse ages, cultures, and incomes;
- Modifications of street sections resulting in a hierarchy of streets that better respond to neighborhood context and needs;
- Placement of land uses and amenities that offers a new identity for the Harlem Park community.

Harlem Park presents some particularly intractable and difficult problems and we do not pretend that urban design alone can ameliorate pervasive social problems. But by understanding the social history, the physical form and the architectural language of the context, we believe that good urban design can help to envision solutions that can bring positive change to the neighborhood and the region. We foresee the day when Harlem Park will no longer be characterized by high vacancy and associated social problems, but will instead be known for its vibrancy, healthy living, quality open spaces, and housing opportunities for all. We see opportunities for the community to overcome current problems, unite the neighborhoods of the West Side, and become a Baltimore neighborhood of choice in the 21st century.
Urban Design and The “Left-over” City;
Five Options for Revitalization